

**To:** "Kuenster, Gail" [kuenster@water.ca.gov]  
**Cc:** Paul Jones/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]  
**From:** Josh Collins  
**Sent:** Tue 4/19/2011 6:21:56 PM  
**Subject:** Re: BDCP CRAM assessment  
[kuenster@water.ca.gov](mailto:kuenster@water.ca.gov)  
[kuenster@water.ca.gov](mailto:kuenster@water.ca.gov)  
[josh@sfei.org](mailto:josh@sfei.org)  
[josh@sfei.org](mailto:josh@sfei.org)  
[kuenster@water.ca.gov](mailto:kuenster@water.ca.gov)  
[Hotspot](#)  
[josh@sfei.org](mailto:josh@sfei.org)  
[rcr@robertsecp.com](mailto:rcr@robertsecp.com)

Hi

I'm ok before 10 am.

Josh Collins  
Sent from iPhone

On 2011-04-19, at 10:25 AM, "Kuenster, Gail" <kuenster@water.ca.gov> wrote:

Josh and Paul,

Would the two of you be available to meet or conference call on Tuesday morning (4/26)?

Gail

Gail Kuenster

Division of Environmental Services

Department of Water Resources

3500 Industrial Blvd.

West Sacramento, CA 95691

(916) 376-9780

(916) 879-2686 cell

From: Josh Collins [mailto:josh@sfei.org]  
Sent: Sunday, April 17, 2011 6:54 PM  
To: Kuenster, Gail

Cc: Rainer Hoenicke; Bill Orme; Paul Jones; Craig Wilson  
Subject: Re: BDCP CRAM assessment

Hi Gail

Thanks for your email.

I note that an inter-agency meeting including the Sac USACE is being set up for mid May to discuss much of the same ideas about CRAM, but in relation to mitigation planning for the High Speed Rail. The intent is to form a regulatory team to help coordinate and advise the "watershed approach" to mitigation, using WRAMP tools, for the Merced to Bakersfield segment. Maybe the same team can advise the BDCP application of basically the same approach?

The rationale is that the watershed approach to mitigation (avoidance, minimization, developing mitigation ratios, mitigation site selection, monitoring plans) for these large infrastructure projects (and there will be others like CV flood control and highway realignments) should be coordinated, especially during the first generation of applications of the approach.

The planning for that meeting is just starting. I expect Mike Jewell is on the list of invitees, but perhaps Mike Nepstad should be invited also, or instead?

I'm cc'ing folks who can help with the answers.

Here we go!

Cheers  
Josh Collins  
Lead Scientist  
San Francisco Estuary Institute  
7770 Pardee Lane  
Oakland CA 94621-1424  
Phone: 510 746 7365

From: "Gail Kuenster" <kuenster@water.ca.gov>  
To: "Josh Collins" <josh@sfei.org>  
Sent: Saturday, April 16, 2011 8:31:24 AM  
Subject: RE: BDCP CRAM assessment

Hi Josh,

I was in training most of Thurs and all day Friday so have not been able to address your email. I did want to let you know that we have been given the go ahead to work on getting an Interagency Agreement in place with ASC. Additionally, management would like me to get assurance from the USACE that this revised CRAM methodology will be acceptable in helping the USACE determine the LEDPA for the conveyance options.

I have not had time to think this through thoroughly but I would like to meet with you and Paul fairly soon and I will get back in touch with Mike Nepstad (USACE) to set up a meeting. Paul would be there because of USEPA involvement but it might be helpful to have you attend this meeting with the USACE also (something you, Paul, and I can discuss).

I am in Sacramento Mon, Tues, and Wed this next week so will get back in touch with you and try to set up a time that works for Paul also. (are you still available in the pm of those days).

Gail

---

From: Josh Collins [josh@sfei.org]  
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2011 9:44 AM  
To: Kuenster, Gail  
Subject: Re: BDCP CRAM assessment

Hi Gail

Yes. ASC is still interested. Here's why. ASC is still on point for implementing WRAMP in Northern California on behalf of the California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup (CWMW). What does that mean? It means ASC needs to respond to opportunities to transfer the WRAMP framework and methodologies to local, regional, state, and federal agencies. The best opportunities are requests for assistance on large projects requiring assessments of aquatic resources. The CWMW has endorsed (that might be too formal a term - maybe the right term is "encouraged by") four opportunities: mitigation planning for the Highway 101 bypass project at Willits (almost done), riparian and wetland mapping and ambient assessment for the Central Valley Flood Control Project (on hold until Phase 2 of the mapping effort), mitigation planning for the High Speed Rail (in early planning stage), and alternatives analysis for Delta Conveyance (in early planning stage).

I think what we need to do ("we" meaning you and I, and probably Paul Jones of Region 9 USEPA, and whomever else you think should be involved) is start fresh with a discussion of what the ASC role would be. It won't be hard to pick up from where we were last winter.

BTW: Chad Roberts is a private consultant and an associate of ASC (we turn to him for some additional capacity as needed) but he does not need to be in this formative meeting. He can be, if you want him there, but I would have to pay him out of other project monies which I don't like doing. We can however build him into the scope of work (SOW). I think we should.

What do I see as the SOW? Well, we're functionally into it already. You and Sarah Pearce have arranged for a CRAM training session. It probably won't be the only one we need. This first one will set the stage and cover the needs for some attendees, but I expect there will be another session or two to bring field staff and consultants up to working speed. And, you and Kristen Cayce have talked about the mapping standards. I'm not sure of the status of your conversation with Kristen, but she will brief me today. I think you and I are both suggesting that the next step is for "we" (see paragraph above) to sit down together and scope the basic tasks going forward, which ASC would turn into a proposal. That meeting might take half a day.

The major questions I have going into our scoping meeting are:

1. To what extent do you want to use the WRAMP framework to organize the overall alternatives analysis? I think it might be very helpful. For example, to-date we have only talked about Level 1 (mapping) and Level 2 (CRAM assessment of overall condition of wetlands and wadeable streams and riparian areas) - but do you want to use the 1-2-3 framework of WRAMP to help organize and define needs for Level 3 data (quantitative data about specific resources such as fishes, birds, etc)?
2. To what extent do you want to employ the Wetland Tracker data management tools? I suggest this might be very helpful to you all the way through planning and permitting and monitoring.
3. Do you want to link to the Delta Portal? As envisioned, Wetland Tracker can feed the portal.
4. Who will do the Level 1 mapping (I assume you with ASC providing training and QAQC), Level 2 field work (I assume State staff and/or consultants with ASC providing training and QAQC), and Level 3 data compilation and new data collection (I assume State staff and/or consultants perhaps with ASC providing training for data

management through Tracker).

5. Who is playing the role as prime contractor for the EIR-EIS? In other words, who will manage the flow of data and information from the field to the report?

As you can probably tell, I'm suggesting that ASC focus on transferring the WRAMP framework to managers at DWR and its prime consultants, transferring the tool set to the data collectors, with the toll set including Wetland Tracker for data and information management and visualization. But, I'm most interested in hearing your questions and getting them answered.

So, when to meet? Do you want to call a meeting to which you invite whomever you want? That works for me. You can set the agenda. It's your meeting. Here is my availability over the short term at this time. I note that at least you and I could do an evening meeting one night of the DWR training May 3-5.

April 25-27 afternoons

April 28 morning

May 6 all day

May 10-11 all day

May 19 morning

May 20 all day

May 25-26 all day

Cheers

Josh Collins  
Lead Scientist  
San Francisco Estuary Institute  
7770 Pardee Lane  
Oakland CA 94621-1424  
Phone: 510 746 7365

---

From: "Gail Kuenster" <kuenster@water.ca.gov>  
To: josh@sfei.org  
Cc: "Chad Roberts" <rcr@robertsecp.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 10:29:10 AM  
Subject: BDCP CRAM assessment

Hi Josh and Chad,

We are again in talks trying to move forward with BDCP Alternatives Analysis and hoping to be able to get an Agreement approved for ASC help in developing the methodology based on the WRAMP framework.

If we are able to move forward, is there still the possibility that you (ASC) will have time to put into this effort such as we were discussing last fall/winter. Before I continue pushing this through management, I need to know if there's still the potential for your help. There is the possibility we could put the agreement on fast track to start work as soon as June 1.

I am available to discuss whenever is convenient for you.

Thanks, Gail

Gail Kuenster  
Division of Environmental Services

Department of Water Resources  
3500 Industrial Blvd.  
West Sacramento, CA 95691  
(916) 376-9780  
(916) 879-2686 cell